

Date: Fri, 2 Jul 93 04:30:20 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #213  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 2 Jul 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 213

Today's Topics:

    NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas (3 msgs)  
    Presence of control operator (5 msgs)  
    Repeater Turkeys

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: 1 Jul 93 18:19:23 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!  
jayk@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Paul Flaherty (paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu) wrote:  
: The results I mentioned came from a pair of pair of programs

Which programs were you using??

Jay K0GU

-----  
Date: Thu, 1 Jul 93 20:18:22 GMT  
From: swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!  
headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C9I08B.Fsz@fc.hp.com> jayk@fc.hp.com writes:  
>Which programs were you using??

The propagation program is Dave Mill's minimuf.c, which is available via anonymous ftp from udel.edu. It's undocumented (I'm working on that), so you'll have to read through the code to make sense of it. The antenna code is my own (gorf.c), which creates the gain profile which minimuf.c uses.

Both of these should be available fairly soon from w6yx.stanford.edu.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----

Date: 1 Jul 93 04:59:08 EDT  
From: pacbell.com!iggy.GW.Vitalink.COM!wetware!spunky.RedBrick.COM!psinntp!  
psinntp!arrl.org@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:  
>1. What the heck is an S Unit?

>

>In this regard, it would be a Good Thing if someone (ARRL?) would issue some  
>sort of standard, including a standard signal level for S9. It would really  
>be nice to have \*meaningful\* signal reports. This would also help in  
>reducing power levels to the minimum necessary to maintain communications.

I'd be inclined reward the first manufacturer to implement an accurate and affordable S-meter on an all band HF transceiver. +/- 1 dB across -120 to 0 dBm would be nice. Actually, who needs S-units? Why not have the radio give your choice of microvolts across a 50 ohm load or dBm? I think this would make it easier to calculate path loss. Thus, whoever does the nifty engineering to make a standard realistic/practical should have a large say in what standard is adopted.

In practice, some transceivers don't even hold "calibration" across an amateur band, much less over time and temperature. Due to time constraints, we normally just tell people how bad things are from band to band in product reviews. The real high priced mil-spec receivers often have fudge factor chips to get things a little closer to reality, but how much are hams willing to pay for this?

The FM IF chips that feature linear s-meters are often quite temperature sensitive, though I suppose you could put them in an controlled oven :-). Thus, even if there was a standard, it would be pretty meaningless due to all the uncalibrated instruments out there. But, if someone can tell you precisely how much power you are delivering to his receiver, along with the expected uncertainty of measurement, he probably has something decent.

Zack Lau KH6CP/1

Internet: zlau@arrl.org "Working" on 24 GHz SSB/CW gear  
Operating Interests: 10 GHz CW/SSB/FM  
US Mail: c/o ARRL Lab 80/40/20 CW  
225 Main Street Station capability: QRP, 1.8 MHz to 10 GHz  
Newington CT 06111 modes: CW/SSB/FM/packet  
amtor/baudot  
Phone (if you really have to): 203-666-1541

-----  
Date: Thu, 1 Jul 1993 19:00:12 GMT  
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!  
news.dtc.hp.com!srngenprp!alanb@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Presence of control operator  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Fred Lloyd [Phoenix SE] (flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com) wrote:  
: In article <C9CuHC.IM3@cmptrc.lonestar.org> carter@cmptrc.lonestar.org  
: (Carter Bennett) writes:

: >... There will be a control  
: >operator for every control point, whether it is the Extra or someone else.  
: >These control operators must never exceed the privileges granted to them  
: >by their operator license.

: The club station call is a good example where nobody's personally  
: responsible. The first time I operated at a club-call FD station  
: (W6OTX - Palo Alto), they flatly stated that any operator with any  
: class could operate on any band under the club callsign. ...

: The rec.radio.lawyers will undoubtedly argue this ad-infinitum but what  
: we have here is a de-facto rule. It now seems that a significant  
: number of field day parties now consider that the class of the callsign  
: used dictates the band privlidges.

This is not a case of armchair lawyers splitting hairs. The FCC reg's  
are unequivocal: There must ALWAYS be a control operator on duty  
licensed to operate on the frequency in use. You can ignore the rule

if you like, but it is a blatant violation of FCC rules.

: The FD band privlidge extension is now accepted practice. Deal with it.

You are mistaken. Every FD group I have ever participated in (about half a dozen groups over the years) has abided by the control operator rule.

: Lets face it: to be leagal it would probably be necessary to say:

: CQ Field Day, CQ Field Day, this is KB1xxx/W1xx

That's true only if the control operator's license is HIGHER than the station license. You can avoid that situation simply by making the FD callsign = call of highest-class licensee in the group. In the situation under discussion (lower-class or unlicensed person sending, under the supervision of higher-class control operator), no special ID is required.

AL N1AL

-----

Date: Thu, 1 Jul 1993 18:32:20 GMT

From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!  
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!wjturner@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Presence of control operator

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <20t1b6INNbm1@west.West.Sun.COM> flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd [Phoenix SE]) writes:

>The club station call is a good example where nobody's personally  
>responsible.

Actually, my understanding (with some help from the FCC Rule Book, is that the station trustee (there has to be one) and the control operator are responsible. That means whoever is at the controls is responsible.

>The first time I operated at a club-call FD station  
>(W60TX - Palo Alto), they flatly stated that any operator with any  
>class could operate on any band under the club callsign.

Who is they? If it wasn't the FFC, they don't have the authority. I believe if you check the FCC Rule Book (boy does it come in handy) you'll find the call belongs to the station--not the ham--but the ham still only has certain priviledges, even when operating a different station. Thus, since I have an Advance class license I can only transmit in the Advanced bands even when I am my Grandfather's station and its call. (He has an Amateur Extra class license.)

>The rec.radio.lawyers will undoubtedly argue this ad-infinitum but what  
>we have here is a de-facto rule. It now seems that a significant  
>number of field day parties now consider that the class of the callsign  
>used dictates the band privlidges.

Unfortunately, the argument is going to go on, but it really isn't a rule,  
even a de facto one. As you point out, a lot of hams are just ignoring the  
rules--real ones--when it suits them.

>The FD band privlidge extension is now accepted practice. Deal with it.

I think this discussion shows it isn't all that accepted.

>Lets face it: to be leagal it would probably be necessary to say:

>

>CQ Field Day, CQ Field Day, this is KB1xxx/W1xx

No, you only need to do that if you are operating a station with a lower class  
callsign than the priviledges you are using (and presumably have). If you  
hold the lower class license, then you are still operating the station within  
its allotted priviledges and thus you don't need to use your station's call at  
all.

A lot of the rest of the stuff I deleted talked about the relaxed practices on  
FD. Unfortunately, all of it was true. However, the arguement is \*not\* over  
whether or not these practices take place--we know they do--but if they are  
legal. I think that if we all would just take a little time to look up some  
of these rules, we would save a lot of bandwidth that has been going to these  
\*stupid\* discussions.

Look it up!!!!!!

--

Will Turner, NORDV	-----
wjturner@iastate.edu	"Are you going to have any professionalism,
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu	or am I going to have to beat it into you?"
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov	-----

-----

Date: 1 Jul 93 18:29:32 GMT  
From: psinntp!psinntp!ncrgw2.ncr.com!ncrhub2!torynews!kevin@RUTGERS.EDU  
Subject: Presence of control operator  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <20t1b6INNbm1@west.West.Sun.COM> flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd  
[Phoenix SE]) writes:

>  
>Finally, those who think Field Day is an emergency preparedness drill,  
>well, the please explain the proliferation of barbecue grills, ice chests,  
>tents, motorhomes, four wheel drives and portable generators which are  
>no doubt kept on hand for just such an occasion. Couple this with  
>the surge in sales of radio equipment and accessories in the days  
>and weeks immediately preceeding the exercise. Yes, it's an emergency  
>alright, at this time of year, I'll do about anything to get out

Exactly! All the equipment that is purchased a couple of weeks before Field Day will still be on hand during the next year and available for real emergency use. If it weren't for Field Day, people would not be as prepared for an emergency because they would have no motivation to procure the necessary emergency equipment.

The fact that you see a lot of barbecue grills, ice chests, etc. is just due to everyone knowing when the "emergency" will happen. In a real emergency there would still be all these things, only they may not be set up before the antennas ;-)

--

[] [] [] [] [] []	Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ	NCR Torrey Pines
[] [] [] [] []	kevin.sanders@torreypinesca.ncr.com	(619) 597-3602
[] [] [] [] [] []	kevin%beacons@cyber.net	
[] [] [] [] []		
[] [] [] [] [] []	Dump MS-DOS. Prevent Programmer Burnout with Linux.	

-----

Date: 1 Jul 1993 20:36:09 GMT  
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Presence of control operator  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> That's true only if the control operator's license is HIGHER than the  
> station license.

...and he's operating on a frequency/mode that exceeds the station licenses operating authority.

-----

Date: Fri, 2 Jul 1993 00:24:18 GMT  
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!csn!csn!stortek!georgen@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Presence of control operator  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun24.180452.24730@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com

(nuts2u::little) writes:

> For a field day station being under the call sign of an extra class  
> licensee, presumably non-extra class operators can use the extra class  
> frequencies provided there is an extra class control operator present.  
> My question is, how present does the control operator need to be?  
> Normal definitions I've seen require the control operator to actually  
> control the radio, i.e. the non-extra class operator is considered a  
> 3rd party. Is this interpretation correct? How have other field day  
> groups handled this?

Hmmmm, the KONA group seems to have cured that problem using an indirect manner ---- all ops are extra class.

73 George, W1XE

-----

Date: Thu, 1 Jul 1993 23:21:04 GMT  
From: news.cerf.net!pagesat!spssig.spss.com!feenix.metronet.com!  
marcbg@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Repeater Turkeys  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Here in the great Dallas Metroplex, we are having quite a few problems with repeater turkeys. It ranges from dead-keys, music, to digitized obscenity keychains (little boxes that are attached to keychains and have buttons to push which utter obscenities).

The problem: They are very smart. They are mobile, vary their signal strength, and only our super sleuths with Dopplers can help out, and then only when they have time available.

On the worst affected machine, we have an ACC controller, so we're able to play some games which discourage turkeys. However, the repeater is very widely used as it is one of the main machines in Dallas.

I throw this point of information up to possibly solícite some constructive discussion on the topic, possible solutions, other angles, etc.

Any help is appreciated!

--

Marc B. Grant, N5MEI            Internet: marcbg@feenix.metronet.com  
P.O. Box 850472            Telephone: 214-231-3998 (voice)  
Richardson, TX 75085-0472       214-231-0025 (fax)

-----

Date: 1 Jul 1993 20:33:45 GMT

From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun28.161019.25628@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,  
<feustelC9CwAz.GvK@netcom.com>, <gchristianson-300693135239@csite-kip63.kip-  
pppl.gov>  
Subject : Re: NJ Tells Tandy, don't sell 800MHz scanners in NJ.

> What other state would pass a law making  
> it illegal for me to order an egg over easy in a diner? (I must be  
> protected by Big Nanny in Trenton from the danger of salmonella).

It was the next step after they made sure that the after-dinner mints  
were safe for human consumption.

-Ron

-----  
Date: 2 Jul 1993 05:52:49 GMT  
From: cthomas@athena.mit.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C9CuHC.IM3@cmptrc.lonestar.org>, <20t1b6INNbm1@west.West.Sun.COM>,  
<1993Jul1.182932.16929@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>mas  
Subject : Re: Presence of control operator

In article <1993Jul1.182932.16929@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>  
kevin@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com (Kevin Sanders) writes:

>  
>The fact that you see a lot of barbecue grills, ice chests, etc. is  
>just due to everyone knowing when the "emergency" will happen. In a real  
>emergency there would still be all these things, only they may not be  
>set up before the antennas ;-)

I liked the way ours went. It was more like an emergency type. One person  
went and found tables. A couple of dropped by the shack and grabbed a  
dipole. Another guy dropped off an antenna. I grabbed my packet setup  
and took off. Another guy brought HF with him as he drove in.  
We were setup and on the air in 45 minutes. That includes finding  
people to let us on the roof of one building and finding a ladder from  
another person to let us on the roof of another building to put up the  
80m dipole.  
We were torn down afterwards in 22 minutes. The area looked better  
than we found it too.

--Michael T. Ford  
<cthomas@media.mit.edu>



W1MX/WZ0C

-----  
Date: 1 Jul 93 21:29:45 GMT  
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@RUTGERS.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C9CuHC.IM3@cmptrc.lonestar.org>, <20t1b6INNbm1@west.West.Sun.COM>,  
<C9I0tx.DzA@news.iastate.edu>  
Subject : Re: Presence of control operator

In article <C9I0tx.DzA@news.iastate.edu> wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Turner) writes:

>Who is they? If it wasn't the FFC, they don't have the authority. I believe  
>if you check the FCC Rule Book (boy does it come in handy) you'll find the  
>call belongs to the station--not the ham--but the ham still only has certain  
>priviledges, even when operating a different station. Thus, since I have an  
>Advance class license I can only transmit in the Advanced bands even when I am  
>my Grandfather's station and its call. (He has an Amateur Extra class  
>license.)

If you are operating your grandfathers station with your call, then you would be limited to your Advanced privaledgees.

If you are operating your grandfather's station with his call AND with him present, then you can operate with his privaledgees. That's no different than allowing an unlicensed individual to operate a station in the presence of the control operator.

As such, there's nothing wrong with my daughter (unlicnensed) using my 2m HT to call "K2UNK monitoring" on our local repeater and holding a QSO with whoever answers AS LONG AS I AM RIGHT THERE as the control operator.

At the field day site we set up, we invite non hams to operate in the presence of control operators all the time. Nothing wrong with that.

>>The rec.radio.lawyers will undoubtedly argue this ad-infinitum but what  
>>we have here is a de-facto rule. It now seems that a significant  
>>number of field day parties now consider that the class of the callsign  
>>used dictates the band privlidges.

It does as long as the holder of the call sign is present as the control operator, or another ham with equivalent level of proivaledgees is present if the ham with the field day call isn't nearby.

>Unfortunately, the argument is going to go on, but it really isn't a rule,

>even a de facto one. As you point out, a lot of hams are just ignoring the  
>rules--real ones--when it suits them.

>

>>The FD band privlidge extension is now accepted practice. Deal with it.

>

>I think this discussion shows it isn't all that accepted.

But I think there's misinterpretation on your part as to what is/isn't  
OK per the FCC rules.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

-----

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)

Morristown, NJ                      email via UUCP              bcr!cc!whs70

201-829-2879 Weekdays            email via Internet    whs70@cc.bellcore.com

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #213

\*\*\*\*\*